

## **REMARKS**

This Response is submitted in reply to the Final Office Action dated March 29, 2011. No amendments are made in this Response. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 29-35, 62, and 64 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-18, 21-28, and 41-60 stand previously canceled. Claims 19, 20, 36-40, 61, and 63 stand previously withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected:

- i. Claims 29-31, 33-35, and 62 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2004/0105641 to Lewis (“Lewis”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,216,227 to Goldstein et al. (“Goldstein”), and further in view of U.S. Publication 2009/0125429 to Takayama (“Takayama”); and
- ii. Claim 64 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis, in view of Goldstein and Takayama, and further in view of U.S. Patent 7,392,226 to Sasaki et al. (“Sasaki”).

For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse these rejections.

### **Independent Claim 29**

Even if properly combinable, the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest, at a minimum, “(k) causing the electronic ticket platform center to... (ii) delete or nullify the at least one of the plurality of electronic tickets from the first information storage chip in response to said at least one of the plurality of electronic tickets being assigned from the first information storage chip to the second information storage chip, wherein the first information storage chip is mounted on a first portable device and the second information storage chip is mounted on a second portable device separate from the first portable device” as recited in independent Claim 29.

The Examiner relies on Lewis as a base reference to teach the electronic platform center. Office Action, page 3. Specifically, the Examiner relies on Lewis’s main computer system 158 capable of hosting numerous websites to teach the claimed electronic platform center. Office Action, page 3.

Recognizing the deficiencies of Lewis, the Examiner acknowledges that Lewis does not teach causing main computer system 158 to “delete or nullify the at least one of the plurality of

electronic tickets from the first information storage chip in response to said at least one of the plurality of electronic tickets being assigned from the first information storage chip to the second information storage chip, wherein the first information storage chip is mounted on a first portable device and the second information storage chip is mounted on a second portable device separate from the first portable device.” Office Action, page 9.

The Examiner turns to Takayama for this element. Office Action, page 10. Takayama, paragraph [0245] discloses:

According to the invention cited in claim 53, a first electronic wallet generates a ticket transfer certificate message confirming that the electronic ticket stored in the second storage means is to be transferred to a second electronic wallet, and transmits the ticket transfer certificate message via wireless communication means to the second electronic wallet; the second electronic wallet transmits, to the service providing means, the ticket transfer certificate message that is received; the service providing means performs an examination to establish the validity of the ticket transfer certificate message that is received, and transmits, to the second electronic wallet, an electronic ticket that is described in the ticket transfer certificate message; and the second electronic wallet stores, in the second storage means thereof, the electronic ticket that is received.

In other words, Takayama teaches that a first electronic wallet stores a ticket to be transferred to a second electronic wallet. The first electronic wallet sends a ticket transfer message to the second electronic wallet. Upon receiving the ticket transfer message, the second electronic wallet relays the ticket transfer message to the service providing means (i.e. Lewis's main computer system 158). The service providing means then sends the ticket to the second electronic wallet. Thus, according to this embodiment, both the first electronic wallet and the second electronic wallet have a copy of the ticket.

Both electronic wallets having a copy of the same ticket is problematic. For example, two people could each have a ticket for the same seat at an event. However, Takayama intends to transfer the ticket from one person to another, and not copy the ticket. In view of this, Takayama further discloses at paragraph [0247]:

According to the invention cited in claim 54, the second electronic wallet, upon receiving the ticket transfer certificate message, generates a ticket receipt message confirming that the ticket transfer certificate message has been received, and transmits the ticket receipt message via the wireless communication means to the first electronic wallet; and the first electronic wallet, upon receiving the ticket receipt message, deletes the electronic ticket stored in the second storage means

thereof. Therefore, the electronic ticket can be precisely transferred, and the problems that may accompany such a transfer can be avoided.

Thus, the second electronic wallet generates a ticket receipt upon receiving the ticket transfer message from the first electronic wallet. The second electronic wallet then sends the ticket receipt to the first electronic wallet. When the first electronic wallet receives the ticket receipt from the second electronic wallet, the first electronic wallet deletes its copy of the ticket. Accordingly, the first electronic wallet no longer stores the ticket.

However, *Takayama's service providing means (i.e. Lewis's main computer system 158 and the alleged "electronic ticket platform center") that supplies the ticket to the second electronic wallet does not delete the ticket from the first electronic wallet.* Instead, the second electronic wallet sends the ticket receipt to the first electronic wallet causing the first electronic wallet to delete the ticket. Thus, Takayama's deletion process is independent of the service providing means. On the other hand, Applicants claim "*(k) causing the electronic ticket platform center to... (ii) delete or nullify the at least one of the plurality of electronic tickets from the first information storage chip in response to said at least one of the plurality of electronic tickets being assigned from the first information storage chip to the second information storage chip, wherein the first information storage chip is mounted on a first portable device and the second information storage chip is mounted on a second portable device separate from the first portable device.*" (Emphasis added).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the obviousness rejection with respect to independent Claim 29, and the claims that depend thereon, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

#### **Dependent Claim 64**

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claim 64 is patentable over the cited art of record for at least the same reasons as discussed above, and for the additional patentable elements recited therein.

For example, the Examiner acknowledges that Lewis, Goldstein, and Takayama fail to disclose or suggest "before assigning the at least one of the plurality of electronic tickets from the first information storage chip to the second information storage chip, causing the electronic ticket platform center to: (c) receive identification information of the second information storage chip specified by the user of the first information storage chip; (d) receive a password, specified

by the user of the first information storage chip, for writing the at least one of the plurality of electronic tickets into the second information storage chip" as recited in dependent Claim 64. Office Action, page 14.

The Examiner turns to Sasaki to teach these elements. Office Action, page 14. Sasaki discloses a network-linked electronic ticket system where network-linked electronic tickets are issued to user's virtual wallets. Col. 4, lines 29-64. The network-linked electronic ticket includes an "electronic ticket" and a "network electronic ticket." Col. 4, lines 50-52. Sasaki summarizes the "electronic ticket" and the "network electronic ticket" at col. 29, lines 47-57:

For the concepts of the "electronic ticket" and the "network electronic ticket," the "electronic ticket" is a generic name for electronic information having a negotiable securities character that can be installed for use. It also includes "electronic money." On the other hand, the "network electronic ticket" is account for receiving information service and/or program information for performing data processing to receive information service. Both are entirely different from each other.

In other words, the "electronic ticket" can represent a ticket granting access to an event while the "network electronic ticket" essentially represents user login information necessary for connecting to a network. See col. 29, lines 21-28.

The Examiner cites col. 11, lines 20-31 of Sasaki which discloses that the "electronic ticket" includes an electronic ticket ID 1012 that is identification information unique to each electronic ticket. Office Action, page 14. The Examiner then cites col. 30, lines 5-14 disclosing the "network electronic ticket" includes a certificate describing identification information of the network-linked electronic ticket and a network-linked electronic ticket storage terminal. Office Action, page 15. The "network electronic ticket" basically replaces a user ID and password that a user uses to log into a network/service provider. Col. 30, lines 15-22.

The Examiner concludes on page 15 of the Office Action, "[i]n this case, since there is a certificate that describes the identification information which relates to ID and password, it is obvious that when determining if the ticket can be transferred to another person, this ID and password is applied and therefore [Claim 64] is suggested by Sasaki."

First, even if, arguendo, "it is obvious that when determining if the ticket can be transferred to another person, this ID and password is applied" as the Examiner concludes, this is not what Applicants claim. All this means is that the ID and password of the person who already

has the ticket is used to determine if the ticket can be transferred. The ID and password allegedly within the network-linked electronic ticket is unrelated to “identification information of a second storage chip” that the ticket is to be transferred to as claimed. Likewise, applying Sasaki’s user ID and password does not suggest that the person who already has the ticket specifies a password “for writing the at least one of the plurality of electronic tickets into the second information storage chip” as claimed. The password Sasaki discloses merely relates to a password associated with a user ID used to authenticate a user when logging into a network/service provider. See Col. 1, lines 1-24 and Col. 30, lines 15-22.

Second, Sasaki teaches away from using IDs and passwords as the Examiner suggests. In the Background section, Sasaki describes related art that uses IDs and passwords in electronic ticket systems. Col. 2, lines 1-24. Sasaki criticizes these systems and lists several problems with using IDs and passwords. Col. 2, lines 23-44. For example, “the service provider needs to provide a database, etc., for managing information of the registered membership IDs, passwords, etc., and thus must bear the high administration cost.” Col. 2, lines 37-40. In view of these problems, Sasaki replaces the IDs and passwords with a “network electronic ticket” that is stored in the user’s network-linked electronic ticket.

Thus, the personal consumer need not register his or her ID or password for the provider and need not enter the ID or password each time and safety is enhanced and the convenience of the personal consumer is also improved. The service provider need not provide a database for managing the information of the registered membership IDs, passwords, etc., and the costs of the entire system can be reduced.

Col. 30, lines 15-22. Therefore, any assertion that Sasaki teaches causing an electronic ticket platform center to receive identification information and a password is in direct contradiction to the explicit language of Sasaki.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the obviousness rejection with respect to dependent Claim 64 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

## Conclusion

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for formal allowance, and allowance is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner contact the undersigned.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing.

Respectfully submitted,

K&L GATES LLP

BY PK Schmidt

Patricia Kane Schmidt  
Reg. No. 46,446  
Customer No. 29175  
Phone: 312-807-4363

Dated: May 23, 2011